



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/616,746	07/14/2000	Sevastian Nick	000-009A	6837

7590 02/14/2002

Jeffrey Thurnau
The Gates Corporation
Mail Stop 31-4-1-A3
900 S Broadway
Denver, CO 80209

EXAMINER

DUVERNE, JEAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/616,746

Applicant(s)

Nick

Examiner

Jean Duverne

Art Unit

2839



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 12, 2001

2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.

2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, and 8 is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 9

20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2839

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-6 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shankle et al (US patent 6,195,016).

For claim 1, Veligdan's device discloses a signal lens (fig. 3) having a light source at 66, a reflective surface at 60, plurality of light transmitting elements at 26 arranged adjacent and parallel to each other to form substantially a planar layer at 24 at the end surface; the light transmitting elements formed a bundle (see abstract of fig. 2). However, Veligdan's device fails to explicitly disclose the light source between the reflective surface and the planar layer. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary in the art at the time the invention was made to move the light source and place it between the reflective surface and the planar layer, since it has been held that rearranging part of an invention of a device involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70.

For claim 2, Veligdan's device discloses the aforementioned limitations except that the angle range of values is not explicitly disclosed. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary in the

Art Unit: 2839

art at the time the invention was made to choose the angle at a range of 0 to 45 degrees, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

For claims 3-5, Veligdan's device discloses the aforementioned limitations including the alignment of the light sources (see fig. 4) with the transmitting elements and they are co-planar and adjacent to the light transmitting element.

For claims 7-8, Veligdan's device discloses the aforementioned limitations including the fiber optic strand 14, and the lens (68, 70, 71) with plurality of light transmitting elements.

Conclusion

2. Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean Duverne whose telephone number is (703) 305 - 0297 . The examiner can normally be reached from 8:30 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Art Unit: 2839

Brian Sircus, can be reached on (703) 308 - 3119. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308 - 7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

JFD

February 11, 2002



Jean P. Duverne

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2839
